

The Principia.

First Principles in Religion, Morals, Government, and the Economy of Life.

VOL. I.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1860.

NO. 48.

The Principia

Published Weekly, at 239 Pearl Street, (two doors above
Harpers' Buildings) New-York.

WILLIAM GOODELL, Editor.

SAMUEL WILDER, Proprietor.

TERMS: One Dollar a year, in advance.

Direct business letters, with remittances, to

MELANCTHON B. WILLIAMS, Publishing Agent,

as above.

PROSPECTUS.

Our object, by this publication, is to promote pure religion, sound morals, Christian reforms; the abolition of slaveholding, caste, the rum-traffic, and kindred crimes—the application of Christian principles to all the relations, duties, business arrangements, and aims of life;—to the individual, the family, the Church, the State, the Nation—to the work of converting the world to God, restoring the common brotherhood of man, and rendering Society the type of heaven. Our text book is the Bible; our standard, the Divine law; our expediency, obedience; our plan, the Gospel; our trust, the Divine promise; our panoply, the whole armor of God.

—Editors friendly, please copy, or notice.

For the Principia.

GERRIT SMITH TO WILLIAM GOODELL.

SECOND LETTER.

In response to William Goodell's Letter of Sept. 29.

PETERBORO, October 1st, 1860.

WILLIAM GOODELL, My old and dear friend:—I have this moment finished reading in the *Principia*, your Review of my Review: and I can truly say, that I never loved you more than I did whilst reading it. You have shown the world with what beautiful patience, kindness, and candor a true christian can treat his opponent. God bless you!

I admit the fairness and strength of your argument, to prove that I was wrong in saying that your assigned reasons for not voting for me, could not have had any considerable weight in bringing you to this conclusion. The logic by which you have so successfully disposed of this part of my Review, is honorable, alike to your understanding and to your magnanimity. I can no longer impeach the force of these reasons upon you. But let me here add that, in my judgment, there is nothing in my Review, to justify your intimation that I have cast "reproach" upon you, and "discredit" upon your "sincerity." If there is, then have I done you a great wrong. [1.]

Allow me to call your attention once more, to these, your reasons, for not voting for me.

1st. *That I despair of the people's voting slavery to death.*

Ought you to let this reason go so far towards disqualifying me for your vote? I think you ought not. Should I be elected President, I should indeed be amazed—amazed to find my old despondency faced with such a proof of the readiness of the people to vote slavery to death. But would either that despondency or this amazement, unfit me to wield the powers of the office? [2.] I did not expect to be chosen Governor in 1858. But had I been, would I have been unfitted for the office, because I had not expected to get it?

Nevertheless, this despondency—especially this "growing despondency"—is an unpardonable sin in your eyes. And yet, how can I help its growth? On coming up from the gates of death—from the entire prostration of both body and brain, [3.] I was greatly pained to see that some of our fellow laborers were leaving us, and that nothing was doing to rally the remainder around our standard. I called upon you and these about you, to get up a Nominating Convention. But in vain. You wrote me that nothing to this end would be done in your part of the State. None of you were willing to do even so little as sign a call for the convention. [4.] In the case of a few noble, but poor men, I offered to pay their expenses to the Convention. Knowing that your wealth is in your head and heart, rather than in your pocket, I offered to bear your's. [5.] (Here let me admit that sickness was an ample justification for your not

attending the Convention.) Moreover, I wrote and printed a long letter to Frederick Douglass, in which I went for such a Convention, and repeated my testimony against voting for men who recognize a law for slavery.

Gladly would I to-day, give hundreds, nay thousands, if my old fellow laborers would act with me on such a scale, to swell the vote for the slave. But they will not. Surely my case is a hard one! I do—and despond because others do not. They do not—and yet denounce me for my despondency. [6.] Be assured, that I do not include you among these do nots. No man has worked harder than you, in the cause of freedom.

However reprehensible my despondency, I must think that you judge me too harshly for it. Indeed, it has long seemed to me that the Abolitionists are disposed to punish me too severely for my offences. I think it was in 1852, that the Ohio or Western Anti-Slavery Society, displeased at something I had said or done, gravely resolved that I was an APOSTATE from the anti-slavery cause. No milder word could come up to the demands of their temper. In 1857, I went all the way to Ohio, to do what I could to saturate the proceedings of Elihu Burritt's Compensation Convention, with radical abolition. How was I rewarded for it? I was instantly caught up, and without giving me one moment, either to justify, or ask pardon, I was pitched to the dogs. And now, in 1860, dear William Goodell, rolling up my many offences into as big and as hard a ball, as that which Brougham wound for the prostration of Canning, exclaims, as he hurls it at my poor head, that I am not fit to be voted for.

Has it never occurred to you, (it often has to me,) that their very severe treatment of each other, is a very great hindrance to the success of the cause of the abolitionists? Unless we are patient with each other, how can we reasonably expect others to be patient with us? If we, who know each other so well, put a low estimate on each other, what right have we to expect that others will put a high estimate upon us? I would not have abolitionists blind to the faults of abolitionists. But I would have them judge each other reluctantly, temperately, and charitably.

2d. *I am in favor of annexing Cuba and Mexico to this nation.*

I see that you have read what I say on this subject, in my speech in Congress, on the Mexican Treaty. I mistake, if your opinion of me at this point, will not be greatly modified by your reading what I say on it, at pages 387 to 400, of the volume of my speeches in Congress. Perhaps you will regard it as but justice, to let your readers know what you think of these pages. In the light of the broad democracy, which I have been wont to attribute to you, I see you entirely agreeing with me on this subject of annexation. [7.]

3d. *I am for making compensation to the emancipating slaveholders.*

It is because I know you, your ethics and your logic, that I am sure you are with me at this point also. Only disabuse your mind of what others say I hold on this subject, and read my writings upon it, and I shall confess my ignorance of William Goodell, if he finds that there exists any essential difference between himself and me, in this matter of compensation. Read, if you please, in the volume spoken of, page 204, and also what I say on this subject, in my letter of February 18th, 1857, to the abolitionists, in the N. Y. Tribune. Read anything else I have written on it. Above all, read the speech I made in the Compensation Convention aforesaid. I have not the least doubt that there will yet be heartfelt regrets among abolitionists, at the deep and cruel injustice which, in their haste, and misapprehension, they have done me on this subject. Although I have, in your judgment, strayed too far away from a sound abolition to be still entitled to votes, yet am I sure that, in this same judgment, I have not fallen so low, as to be disentitled to justice. [8.]

4th. *I am for the disunion of the States. I am a "disunion candidate."*

I confess that I still stand, in the matter of secessions from the Union, where I did when I made my speech on the Mexican Treaty. I cannot admit that I am less strenuously opposed than yourself, to such secessions. We differ only in respect to the means of preventing them. I would employ all moral and political means. So would you, but with the addition of armies. There is more of General Jackson in you, than in me. [9.]

5th. *I purpose to use our Abolition Conventions and facilities toward establishing a religion contrary to the religion of the Bible.*

You deny that this was one of your reasons, [10.] and readily do I admit the sincerity of your denial. But, my dear friend, you must allow me to make, right here, two predictions, 1st, that you will yet come to see that the other four reasons, taken singly, or even collectively, afforded you no justification for refusing to vote for me. Reflection will work this change in you. 2d. That if you shall persevere for a twelve month in believing me to be unfit to be voted for, it will be solely because of my bad religion—my bad religion, which wars not only with orthodoxy, but with Universalism and Unitarianism also, and in short, with every creed and sect, that take shelter in a religion of authority.

And now a very few remarks on a few other things in your Review.

You try, in two instances, the *Argumentum ad hominem*. But I submit that neither of them furnishes the facts necessary to allow you to employ this very effective form of argument. Let us look at them.

1st. You and I preferred, in the Convention at Canastota, (not Syracuse,) the nomination of William Jay, to that of Alvan Stewart, the man of unrivalled genius. But did I refuse to vote for Mr. Stewart at the election, which followed his nomination? You must show that I did, ere you can run a parallel between my position then, and your's now. I need not say that I voted for him. [11.]

2d. Why do I not criticise John Thomas, Abraham Pryne and Henry Catlin, as well as yourself, for not espousing my nomination? Strange question this! As strange a blunder this, as was the other I have just disposed of, for the clear headed William Goodell to fall into! My answer is, that you and I belong to the same party, and that they belong to another. As well might you have asked me why I do not criticise Gov. Seward, and Mr. Greeley, as well as yourself, for not voting for me. [12.]

You bring up against me what people once said about my partiality for Van Buren, Hale and Fremont; and what they now say about my partiality for Lincoln. Your doctrine manifestly is, that if what is thus said of me is not true, I am bound to publish my denials. The difference between us is one of taste only. I see and hear ten thousand foolish things about myself; but it is very rare indeed that I think it necessary to confront them. If the public have not yet learned that I regard no man as fit for civil office who knows law for slavery, it is surely not my fault. [13.]

You intimate that I am not "for concentrating all our energies on the one great issue of NATIONAL ABOLITION;" and I am sincerely sorry that you do. No doubt you fully believe, that this, which you intimate, is truth. Nevertheless, money, money, speeches, speeches, writings, writings— toil, toil, and this too, of one, whose days are days of weary toil, in his large private concerns—all testify with trumpet-tongue, that it is not truth. [14.]

You will probably reply again to me. I shall not need to reply again to you. If my course on the subject of slavery, is the exceptionable and injurious one which you represent it to be, so defences of it, however multiplied or protracted, can avail against your representation.

Your friend,

GERRIT SMITH.

NOTES ON GERRIT SMITH'S LETTER.

[1] We are glad to have this disclaimer. Mr. Smith's argument we said was "a seeming effort to make out that all our reasons for our conclusions were but reasonable and not real ones," which seemed to discredit our sincerity.

[2] Our difficulty was that the despondency of our candidate discouraged others, thus preventing their voting for abolition, and inducing them to desert and go over into the ranks of non-extensionism. The courage of the General is needed, before the battle is fought and won, and as a condition of victory. Anybody could have courage afterwards.

[3] It may have been a calamity. We have not called it a sin. The recent "prostration" may have been the cause of recent and present despondency. Ill health, as we before intimated, may have been the cause of similar despondency years ago. The mischief of it, whatever the causes might have been, remained the same. The withholding of a vote on account of it, is no penal infliction, no censure, but simply an exercise of judgment in the selection of a candidate—nothing more.

[4] Little or nothing has ever yet been done in this city and adjacent region of country. We were unable to add anything to our own labors, already too excessive. Sickness in our family, before our own sickness, made it certain that we could not attend. And we have long disapproved the policy of signing calls, without the prospect of attending. And our friends felt themselves in the condition of an army without a leader.

[5] This we gratefully acknowledge. We have often availed ourselves of similar offers from the same quarter, and do not forget it.

[6] There is much truth and force in this. On the other hand, we presume that Mr. Smith is by no means aware of the great extent to which the evil he complains of has grown out of his perpetual expressions of despondency. There has been a fault on both sides.

[7] Our readers, certainly, shall know what we think of those pages. We had often read them before. We have now read them again. Every time we read them over we are the more deeply impressed with the unsoundness of the reasoning. The promises and the conclusions, the principle and the application, the supposed facts and the argument we consider to be all wrong, from beginning to end. We were never more deeply impressed with it than at this moment. Our "broad Democracy" is not broad enough to justify what (we have before said) we regard equivalent to the importation of all the slaves of Cuba, by the slave trade, even though every man, woman, and child in the United States and in Cuba, bond and free, should vote for it. We deny that the united suffrages of all nations could make it right to become partakers of each others sins, by such an arrangement, bringing the oppressions of one part of the globe to be participated in and endorsed by the other part, and *vice versa*. We deprecate extended nationalities, for this very reason, and because the true ends of government are subverted by them. If we may admit Cuba with Slavery, why not Texas, California, Kansas, and Arizona?

[8] We have not time nor space to discuss the question of Compensation, now. Our Resolution sent to the Syracuse Convention, lately published in the *Principia*, expresses our deliberate opinion. We suppose our earnest dissent from Mr. Smith is doing him no "injustice." The "letter of Feb. 18, 1857," is not at hand, at the moment. The two other documents, above referred to, we have been reading over again, without being able to change our mind.

[9] We confess we do not see what good it would do to have a radical abolition President, it, on his first attempt, or proposal to abolish slavery in the States, the slave holders should threaten secession, whereupon the President should allow them to secede without liberating the slaves. We do not see wherein this would differ, in effect, from choosing an out-and-out dissolution President, before hand. John Driver's recent proposal to Gerrit Smith might then deserve a very respectful consideration. Mr. Smith we think mistakes, greatly, if he supposes that his "Compensation" scheme would help him carry out emancipation if he were President, especially with his notification before hand, that the slave masters, by seceding, could retain their slaves.

[10] We think our friend Smith read our letter and wrote his two hastily to get our meaning on this point, and to respond to it correctly. We fear our second letter, when

he sees it, will compel him to recal or modify this response. On recurring again to our letter, he will find it was not our fifth reason, of which the above is his version, that we denied to be one of our reasons! No. It was *he* that denied, while we affirmed that it was, and defended it, promising to defend it further in our second letter. What we denied to be one of our reasons, was not the fifth, but the sixth, which we had never urged, but which, as we then said, Mr. Smith had kindly manufactured for us, namely, "that we had lost all patience with what we regarded his religion." In the closing part of Mr. Smith's paragraph above, he ruins his argument to that point which conflicts with the beginning of it!

[11] The precise circumstances, we know, are not exactly parallel. But we think the same principle is involved. I might, indeed, oppose a nomination, and yet conclude to vote for the candidate. Or I might still refuse to vote for him. If I still thought my objections well-founded, and of sufficient importance, I should have the same right to withhold my vote, at the polls, that I had in the Convention. And the withholding in the latter case, is no more a breach of friendship, or an aspersion, or accusation of the candidate in the latter case than the former. Abolitionists, we trust, do not hold themselves bound to surrender their convictions to the decision of their party, as other people do.

[12] The logic of our "clear headed friend", Gerrit Smith, then, is this—is it? If William Goodell so far changes his political course as to decline voting for the nominees of the Liberty party, the change must be imputed to the "misleading and bewildering power of his orthodoxy." But if John Thomas, Abram Pryne, and Henry Catlin, who also had formerly voted with the Liberty party, not only decline continuing to do so, but go further, and vote for Lincoln, it is no disparagement of their theology at all, nor do they expose themselves to any criticism or censure! As to "Gov. Seward and Mr. Greeley" we had never heard of their having deserted either Gerrit Smith or the Liberty party. Does Mr. Smith think his "facts" pertinent to the "argument"? Are the cases parallel?

[13] What others might have reported, in this direction, would have had little effect, and would have given little trouble to us, or to others of Gerrit Smith's friends, had it not been for what he himself said, of a kindred character, sometimes publishing it over his own signature. It was this that made them think it more important than a mere matter of taste, when such rumors were uncontradicted.

[14] Far be it from us to disparage or under estimate the monies, toils and labors of Gerrit Smith—not for one object only, but for many—at his own discretion, of course, as is meet, and must needs be. Beset, as he constantly is, we have often wondered how any man could even guess how it was best to appropriate and proportion his gifts or his labors. We intended to say nothing to wound his feelings. We all have our favorite enterprises. A National Abolition of Slavery is ours. When he told the Syracuse Convention that it "would not do well to call for any great outlay of time or money to increase the vote for its tickets," but adding that "we do need to employ presses and lecturers to teach the people the true religion," (as he understands religion, of course,) and when we were reviewing his proposals to annex Cuba and Mexico, his offering compensation, his views of dividing the Union, and what not, we did feel and express strongly our views of the necessity of "concentrating our energies on the one great issue of National Abolition." In this we intended no reproach. We only urged our own views, not meaning to state Mr. Smith's position otherwise than as we supposed he had stated it himself.

In conclusion, this letter, written in a spirit of kindness and candor, is highly creditable to Gerrit Smith. His earnest desire for the abolition of Slavery, no one questions. In respect to measures, we disagree; but not in respect to the object. We trust that good will grow out of this discussion, and repeat that it will not disturb the long standing friendship between ourselves and Gerrit Smith.

Judge PIERREFONT has sent to Gov. MORGAN his resignation of the Superior Court Judgeship, to take effect on the 1st of November. In his communication to the Governor he gives his reasons for this step at length, in which he makes use of some very plain language in reference to the manner in which the City Government is carried on.—*Times*.

For the Principia.

Rev. WILLIAM GOODSELL, Dear Sir:—It seems to me that, in your "review" of the proceedings of the National Abolition Convention, you do yourself great injustice. Do you mean to say that, if you did not expect slavery was to be abolished by voting, you would give up voting? [1.] Surely this is contrary to your acknowledged maxim, "duty is ours, results God's." [2.] Supposing Gerrit Smith thinks the people too corrupt to unite in a political movement against the existence of slavery, does that make it unwise for the righteous few to unite in such a movement? [3.] Surely this is strange logic from you.

Who talks most discouragingly; he who expects but a small vote for liberty, and does not expect a majority, now, or in the future, to vote, but still votes himself, and advises all others to do so, or he who asks to be "counted out?" [4.]

The trouble with Abolitionists, has been that they looked to "do something," as they termed it, rather than to adhere to principle. Success at the ballot box, as the world uses the term, was sought, at the expense of principle. Does our duty to choose just men, grow less binding, because we don't expect the majority will do so? [5.]

But you think a man must recognize the binding authority of the Bible in order to vote right. Yet Gerrit Smith votes right with his "loose views" as you term them, while William Goodell seems disposed to not vote at all. I do not think you commend the Bible in this way. [6.]

You characterize our enterprise, as according to Mr. Smith's view, a hopeless one. Can nothing good be accomplished, without the majority vote with us? Have all the abolition votes up to this time, really been "thrown away," as our opponents tell us? Have you come "to this complexion?" [7.]

You say a people who cannot be brought to vote for liberty, will not fight for it. Admitted; but the slaves, through whose bloody efforts, Mr. Smith predicts, not advises emancipation, have not the ballot box. [8.]

You think the people will yet vote down slavery, but decline yourself, to set them the example. [9.] Mr. Smith thinks they ought to vote it down, but has, and will do his part to produce such a result: [10.] but differs with you in opinion, as to the ultimate means by which slavery will be abolished. [11.] He thinks human passions may be overruled by Providence for its destruction, before the people become sufficiently virtuous and christian, to destroy it by voting. [12.] Strange that this opinion of his, [whether it be right or wrong, time alone can reveal,] should cause you to withhold your support! Again you say, that because, in Mr. Smith's opinion, the people will not vote away slavery and the dramshop, therefore the ballot box is of little consequence. [13.] As well might you say, because they have not voted away these evils, voting is of little account. Are men's souls of little value, because most men practically ignore that value?

But it appears to me the crowning fallacy of your letter, where you do yourself, as well as Mr. Smith and the Convention, most injustice, is in charging him and it with making the "Liberty Party" a "theological, or rather anti-theological engine against the Bible." [14.]

What could have led you to make such a charge, as you certainly do, although you "do not attribute to any one present a deliberate design to transform" it thus, I am at a loss to determine. [15.]

Your keen scent for heresy has misled you in this matter.

Not one syllable, either in Mr. Smith's letter, in the resolutions, or in the debates or proceedings of the Convention, called in question the divine authority of the Bible.

You have manufactured a man of straw, friend Goodell, to do which, you had to quote from, not his letters to the Convention, but Mr. Smith's discourses upon the "Religion of Reason." [16.]

Is this fair? Is it christian? I confess I have not so learned Christ.

You think certain passages in his letter imply what you charge. But is the religion of Jesus Christ, the religion of this country? Every man's religion is to be determined, not by what he professes, but what he does. [17.]

The religion that controls his life, is his religion, no matter whether it be the religion he professes, or not. [18.] In the light of this fact, which you will admit, I pronounce your assumption that the religion of this country, is the religion of Christ, to be a libel upon Christ and His religion. [19.]

Is that Christ's religion, which votes slavery and dramshops lawful and necessary? [20.]

I marvel, too, that you should excuse the pro-slavery voting of the Church of Dr. Cheever, the anti-slavery teacher you so highly eulogize, on the ground that "its members have not yet learned the full extent of their political duties."

This sounds very much like W. H. Seward's "Capital States." Surely, if Dr. C. has been as faithful as you represent him to be, they ought to have learned enough of political duties, by this time, to understand what the Bible says about "choosing just men," for civil rulers.

That church has, I believe, grown enough in that kind of religion, which Mr. S. denounces, to expel a member on account of his views concerning the Sabbath. [21.] Is it worse to err in that respect than to vote unrighteously?

Of course no one could understand Mr. Smith's assertion that "Church and Government" had hitherto been oppress-

are, to mean that none but an oppressive church had ever existed. He evidently referred to the rule, not the exception. [22.] The church may be oppressive in other ways than by supporting chattel slavery. A church that requires its members to harmonize on points of doctrine, while harmony in spirit already exists, is oppressive. Such, it seems is Dr. Cheever's. [23.]

Are you to become *oppressive*, in like manner, by requiring your Presidential Candidate to agree with your theology? [24.]

You err greatly in attributing any of the resolutions to Mr. Smith. He, unlike yourself, confided in the ability of the Convention to make its own resolutions. [25.]

Those presented by the Committee, were drawn by my own hand, previous to going to Syracuse, at my house, in Broome County. I hope you will reconsider your position, and prove yourself not amenable to the charge of *persistence in misconstruing your old friends*. Yours for true religion,
C. A. HAMMOND.

NOTES ON THE LETTER OF C. A. HAMMOND.

The letter of Mr. Hammond was post marked Sept. 17, and must have been written soon after his perusal of our "Review" in the *Principia* of Sept. 15. It has not been convenient for us to publish it sooner. We thought it right to make ourselves fully understood, and to give Gerrit Smith himself a hearing, and reply to him, before opening the discussion to others. Mr. Hammond has now had opportunity to read what has been published, and to think of what he had written to us. As he has expressed no desire to recall, or to revise it, we now publish it entire, as he wrote it.

Were we disposed to retaliate upon him, we might exclude him from our columns. When he had charge of the "STATE LEAGUE" and we had no paper of our own, Mr. CARSON requested us to write steadily, for the *League*, which we engaged to do. Mr. CARSON wished us to write editorially, but we preferred writing over our own initials. Some of our articles appeared in that paper, others of them were excluded, particularly one commenting on Gerrit Smith's "Religion of Reason." Mr. HAMMOND had written articles in the *League* editorially, understood by ourselves and others, to be semi-commendatory of Mr. Smith's pamphlet, or cautiously favoring it. We wrote an article on the other side, which, though received by Mr. Hammond never appeared. We learned, by the gentleman who handed it to him, that he refused printing it. If we correctly remember, he declined editorially, its publication. We learned, further, that when he left the office, he took our article along with him, and declined handing it over to his successor. Nevertheless, we give Mr. Hammond a place in our columns, appending our comments in notes.

[1.] No. Mr. Hammond will find, on re-examination, that we said nothing in advocacy of non-voting, where the opportunity was presented, of voting wisely and properly, in accordance with the conscience and judgment of the voter himself, not in obedience to a Nominating Convention. The privilege or right of voting, is worth nothing, on any other conditions. The subject of non-voting was not before us, at all.

[2.] We said nothing inconsistent with that maxim. We were only discussing the question, *whether it were* a "duty" to vote for a particular candidate, or no. We concluded that, in the present case, it was *not* a duty, but "a duty" to decline doing so, and gave the reason. That "duty," though a painful one, we have performed, leaving the result with God. Mr. Hammond assumes the very point to be proved, namely, the "duty" of voting with the Nominating Convention, and for Gerrit Smith.

[3.] No. That was not our "logic." We said nothing about "giving up" voting! We only thought it unwise to select as our candidate, one who was constantly, and, as we believed, unreasonably, speaking words of discouragement to his supporters. If Gerrit Smith, who scouts as "soul-withering," the orthodox doctrine of total depravity, can't have one half, nor one quarter as much hope of getting the people right, that his orthodox friends have, we think that there is some constitutional or other latent cause of despondency about him, that disqualifies him for a political leader.

[4.] "Counted out" of what? Mr. Hammond writes as though we had "begged to be counted out of the circle" of voters "for liberty." Whereas we only "begged to be counted out of the circle" of a party "discouraged in its enterprise of direct political action, for a national abolition of slavery,

fitting out into a hypothetical disunion party, and using its nominating conventions for theological effect in the enterprise of "supplanting Bible orthodoxy, by the so-called Religion of Reason."

[5.] Certainly not, Mr. Hammond. And we neither said nor implied it. Let us explain. Voting may be regarded in a two-fold view.—*First*, as an instrumentality in an enterprise, to accomplish an object. *Second*, as a testimony of the individual voter, his protest against the majority, his reproof of them, however dark or even hopeless may appear the prospect. In neither of these aspects is the vote to be undervalued. But in the *first*, wherein the *second* is of necessity included, [though the second does not necessarily include the first], a double and quadruple value is to be recognized. It was on the *first* aspect that we were looking in our Review, for we have by no means relinquished either the enterprise of a national abolition of slavery, nor the ballot-box as the grand, ultimate instrumentality of its accomplishment, without which, all other instrumentalities, moral suasion, church action, &c., &c., would be abortive. Much as we think of moral and ecclesiastical action, it is *such* moral and church action, as, in England, urged the people to the polls, as an instrumentality, in the enterprise of a national abolition of all the slavery in the nation—it is *such* moral, religious, and ecclesiastical influence and action—and nothing short of it, or instead of it, that we would promote. It was from this stand point that the "Review" was written, that disturbs Mr. Hammond. We use the ballot box as an instrumentality in the one grand enterprise of a national abolition of slavery. We want and we mean to have (if we have not already,) a political party, that will enter hopefully, resolutely, inflexibly with us, into that specific enterprise, with the same hopefulness, enthusiasm, and determination, that John Brown carried with him to Harper's Ferry, though with different instruments. We want, and intend to have, a John Brown leader for that enterprise. We had hoped, and hoped, and hoped to find that leader in Gerrit Smith. But we find he is not the man. He tells us he is not. He is not likely to be. A "growing despondency," has taken possession of him. To him, the ballot box, the act of voting, have significance, merely, in the *secondary* aspect, as a testimony, a reproof. Just at that point, we must part company with him. We are sorry. We cannot urge him forward with us. We cannot stay behind with him, *Our* nomination, on *our* platform, though often tendered to him, he accepts not. Nay, he declines it. We cannot help it. The enterprise, AS an enterprise, hopeful, resolute, determined, must go forward. It cannot be spared. The slave cannot spare it. The cause of liberty cannot spare it. The cause of religion cannot spare it. Humanity cannot spare it. The enterprise AS an enterprise, hopeful, buoyant, determined, must go forward. There is a leader for that enterprise somewhere. He can be found. And he will be.

[6.] We did say, and we repeat it, that an adequate faith in God's word, is the grand safeguard against despondency, and of the expedients, which we enumerated, growing out of that despondency. William Goodell, believing this, is "disposed to vote," and to vote hopefully, but he insists upon voting his principles, and not against them, of voting for a hopeful candidate, not for a desponding one. Whether or no, this "commends the Bible," Mr. Hammond may judge for himself, and so may others. We cannot help noticing how continuously Mr. Hammond assumes that there is no such thing as as an abolitionist's "voting at all," unless he votes for his candidate!

[7.] This is answered already. As an enterprise, for a national abolition of slavery, by the ballot box, in Mr. Smith's view it is almost, or quite a hopeless one. So he regards it. The testimony of a righteous vote is good, so far as it goes and remains. We do not disparage that good, but we seek more, and must vote accordingly.

[8.] We were not considering, in our Review, the duties of the slaves, in the matter we were discussing, but the duties of abolitionists, free voters of the North. The white people as well as the slaves, have the task before them, of recovering and protecting their *own* rights, and in order to do this, they must recover and protect the equal rights of the slaves. Northern liberty and Northern rights are clobbered down, as well as Southern. Together they must be maintained, or together surrendered. Does C. A. Hammond mean to say that it would be right and proper for

the Liberty party to fail of carrying forward, vigorously, hopefully, and resolutely, the enterprise of restoring, and protecting American liberty, Southern and Northern? Ought the members of that party, to content themselves with merely bearing their own testimony, without carrying that enterprise forward? Would he have them content themselves with "predicting, not advising," a servile insurrection, to free both the North and the South, leaving to the slaves the "bloody efforts" that free men should as resolutely make, by the bloodless ballot box? Shall Northern freemen, be indebted to Southern slaves for their own emancipation, instead of determining to liberate the slaves? Ha, he, and his associates "come to this complexion?"

[9.] Is there no "setting the example" of "voting down slavery" but by voting for a candidate who does not believe that it can be done?

[10.] How much can he do, while continually proclaiming to the world, that he does not believe it will ever be done?

[11.] "The means?" Aye, there is the main question. Shall we rely, under God, upon our own peaceful efforts at the ballot box? Or on the "bloody efforts" of the slaves? That is the question. If I believed in the latter, rather than the former, then, so far as this topic is concerned, I might consent to vote for Mr. Hammond's candidate.

[12.] Our belief in an overruling Providence, giving success to wise and peaceful efforts, makes us prefer such efforts to the protection afforded by "human passions." We know that God sometimes overrules "human passions" to bring terrible deliverances, in just retribution for the sapience and despondency that refuses to employ, hopefully, trustingly, and resolutely, the heaven-approved, legitimate, peaceful ones.

[13.] Not so. Mr. Hammond mistakes our meaning. We were not giving it as *our* opinion that the ballot box was of little consequence! We were only showing how, in the view of Gerrit Smith, it became, comparatively, of little consequence, as his Letter showed. "The philosophy of despondency," we said, accounted for his arriving at that conclusion. Mr. Hammond is *here* fighting his candidate's position, not ours.

[14.] Our second Letter to Gerrit Smith, in the *Principia* of October 6, is our answer to this specification.

[15.] It is quite possible, and not uncommon, for a popular Convention to do, in effect, what it did not design. This, we believed to have been the fact, at Syracuse, and we said so. We think the proof is before the public, and they will judge.

[16.] The readers of our Letters to Gerrit Smith, in the *Principia*, will judge of this, for themselves.

[17.] The religion of Jesus Christ is the religion generally professed by religionists in this Country. That religion is to be judged of, *by itself*, by its own doctrines and its own precepts, *not* by the characters of its professors, whether worthy or unworthy. Every man's *personal* religion is to be determined by what he professes and by what he does. His professions are a part of his doings. We do not mean by this, that a man's professing what is good is a good act unless his life accords with his professions. But we do mean that a man's professions of a wicked belief (a belief in the righteousness of slavery, for example) is itself a wicked act of a wicked man. We make these distinctions to prevent a common error and confusion of terms on this subject.

[18.] Is it no matter, then, whether a man professes a righteous or an unrighteous, an anti-slavery or a pro-slavery religion?

[19.] The truth or the error of this statement depends on the meaning put on the phrase "the religion of this country." The religion commonly professed in this country is the Christian religion. The religion commonly practiced in this country is a very different thing. We have made no assumption that this latter, is the religion of Christ. Nor have we ever found fault with Gerrit Smith or with any body else, for condemning it. No one has gone further than ourselves in condemning it. But when, by a confusion of language, the bad religion of a man's *wrong practice* is transferred to, or confounded with the religion of his professed *creed*, (or professed belief) however correct that creed or belief may be—when the latter is condemned on account of the former, and when the two are wrongfully identified together, then we complain—especially when this

is done as a measure of political reform, and pressed upon political Conventions.

[20] For our answer to this, and what follows, concerning Dr. Cheever's Church, our readers, and Mr. Hammond are referred to our second Letter to Gerrit Smith, in the *Principia* of October 6, which we cannot repeat, here, again.

[21.] Are we to understand Mr. Hammond as lugging in the Sabbath question, and Church polity and discipline, in to this purely political discussion? What has this to do with our reasons for declining to vote for Gerrit Smith? Are we to understand that Dr. Cheever's Church must bring its views of the Sabbath and of Church discipline in to harmony with Mr. Hammond's before it can deserve the cautious limited credit we gave it for acting against slavery?

[22.] His words were.—"I need not add that such a church" [i.e. a "church concerned for the entire interests of all"] and government are yet to be seen. *Hitherto*, both Church and government have been oppressors, instead of protectors. *Hitherto*, false religions and consequently false politics have prevailed in all the earth."

The italics are our own. What Mr. Smith means by the phrase "false religions" we have shown in our second Letter to him, by extracts from his recent writings.

[23.] Mr. Hammond seems to have supplied us, here, with his answer to our questions in Note 21. "The church may be oppressive in other ways than by supporting chattel slavery."—It may be "oppressive" by requiring of its members the observance of the Sabbath.—Is Mr. Hammond prepared to stand by this declaration?—Let him consider it.—The question is not whether Reason, Scripture, or the principles of New-Testament Church polity warrant or require churches to insist that its members shall keep the Sabbath. There will be different views of that question. But suppose ten, twenty, or fifty persons agree in holding the affirmative of that question. Have they not a natural and a civil right to form a Church on that basis—to receive those who agree with them, and exclude those who do not agree with them. Are they the "oppressors" of those whom, by the exercise of church discipline, in accordance with their original mutual agreement, they exclude? If so, civil government must interfere with its writ of injunction, forbidding the disciplinary process. For civil Government must permit no oppression! Should we not soon have a civil oppression of the Church, on that principle? Mr. Hammond, we think, will see his mistake, here.

[24.] Here it comes again.—"Oppression!" William Goodell is guilty of oppression, if he refuses to vote for Gerrit Smith, on such grounds as are satisfactory to his own mind!

Suppose it were so, (as it is not) that we have "required our Presidential candidate to agree with (us) in (our) theology."—Suppose we had required him to subscribe to the Thirty-Nine Articles of the church of England, or to the Westminster Assembly's Catechism, as a condition of receiving our vote? Say, if you please, that it would have been very foolish in us, to have done so, as we think it would. But do not call it "oppression." For then you deny our self-evident right to have and to exercise, freely, our own private judgment in the premises. You might as well deny our right of voting at all. If it be "oppression" then there ought be a statute to prevent us from exercising such oppression, in other words, from voting in accordance with our own convictions. The truth is—as our Letters to Gerrit Smith show, we have not objected to Gerrit Smith as a Presidential Candidate, on account of his Theological opinions. But we have objected, and we do object, as a member of the Liberty party, to his lugging his theological opinions into the Conventions—the nominating Conventions of the Liberty party—composed of men of different creeds, using those Conventions for the dissemination of his own peculiar views, and exhorting the voters to contribute for the support of "presses and lecturers" to help supercede the religion on theology of a majority of the Liberty party by his so-called Theology and "Religion of Reason" as a more important work than increasing votes, from all sects and from no sect, against Slavery and Rum.

[25.] For the second time, Mr. Hammond here plainly intimates that it was obtrusive for us to forward any Resolutions to the Convention. "Its own Resolutions!" As

though William Goodell did not belong to the party. Why might not we (especially on request of the Chairman of the Committee), draw up by our own hand, and send our Resolutions, as Mr. C. A. Hammond says he drew up and carried his? Very manifestly, our personal presence there, had Providence permitted it, would not have been less unacceptable to Mr. Hammond, than were our unfortunate Resolutions.

W. G.

NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY.

NUMBER XXII.

With a Constitution admirably adapted to purposes of right, Why does the Nation tolerate a system of monstrous injustice? Listen to Mr. Abraham Lincoln:

"In this and like communities, public sentiment is everything. With public sentiment, nothing can fail; without it, nothing can succeed. Consequently he who moulds public sentiment, goes deeper than he who enacts statutes or pronounces decisions. He makes statutes and decisions possible or impossible to be executed."

Could Mr. Lincoln have pronounced words more agreeable to truth? He might have added that a righteous national sentiment will make an unrighteous constitutional provision inoperative and of no effect, while an unrighteous national sentiment will convert a righteous Constitution into an instrument of tyranny. He might have referred to the fugitive slave Act of 1793, which, in spite of its pretended constitutionality, remained entirely inoperative many years, for want of a national sentiment to give it effect. He might have told us, too, that because the national sentiment did not demand immediate emancipation, slavery had time to corrupt the national mind to its own support.

Mr. Lincoln is the chosen representative of a great national party. We will venture to assume him as a fair representative of the national sentiment, and see if we cannot, from his published views, make out an answer to the question with which our article opens. Mr. Lincoln regards slavery as "monstrous injustice," and a "state of oppression and tyranny unequalled in the world." Now, can slavery possibly stand a single day against such a conviction of its unrighteous character pervading the national mind? Yes, it can stand forever, if there is nothing but the conviction. A cold passionless conviction of wrong, without a hearty detestation of it, will never prompt to its abolition. Has Mr. Lincoln any such detestation against slavery? Hear him.

"I think I would not hold one in slavery at any rate, yet the point is not clear enough to me to denounce people upon."

This sentence expresses his feelings about slavery, if, indeed, there is any feeling in it. Try similar language with reference to minor wrongs, and see how it will appear. "I think I would not practice theft, nor swindling, nor highway-robbery at any rate; yet the point is not clear enough to me to denounce people upon." Would a national sentiment admitting no stronger expression against these crimes, do anything to hinder them? No, surely. And yet slaveholding demands stronger reprobation than all these crimes together; for how long and how often would one be the victim of such crimes rather than be doomed to a life of slavery? While Mr. Lincoln was a member of Congress, he introduced a bill for the abolition of slavery in the Federal District. That bill is well described by its title. "A Bill to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia by consent of the free white people in said District, and with compensation to owners." Such a bill could do nothing better for the slave than to spread gloom over his prospects, while the slaveholder would be sure to see in it a recognition of his right of property in man, and a guaranty that the question of abolition should remain entirely under his own control. For would the anti-slavery people of the District incur the lawless displeasure of slaveholders by manifesting their consent for abolition? Have they dared to repeat their petition to Congress for the removal of slavery during the last thirty years? Mr. Lincoln's bill came to nothing, of course, as every abolition bill must, if it is not sustained by a determined and uncompromising regard for right. What will be thought of his bill a hundred years hence, if slavery shall have passed away, under the national frown, and the record of his "monstrous injustice" shall remain?

To be "satisfactory" is with Mr. Lincoln a ruling consideration on the subject of abolition. Now, if we set aside justice and right as of no consequence, and aim only at satisfaction, without respect of persons, will not the motive impel, with overwhelming force, to the abolition of slavery? Numerically, the slaves are to the slaveholders at least as ten to one. Is it not greater pleasure to satisfy ten than to satisfy one? But as long as the national mind shall make the satisfaction of a few slaveholders paramount to the rights and satisfaction of many slaves, slavery may defy a Constitution every line of which is a decree of liberty.

I. S.

MR. GOODSELL: Are you quite correct, when you say the slave power has never yet allowed any direct taxes to be levied? I feel rather sure that just after the last war with Great Britain, a collector of a national tax came to a town in Vermont, where I resided, and that the people, myself among them, met him, according to a previous appointment, to pay their taxes.

I. S.

We think our Correspondent is correct. We think we have some indistinct recollections of the same thing.—We had forgotten it. In stating the general fact, we overlooked the particular exception—the only one we can now remember. Possibly there may have been others.

EDITOR.

The Principia.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1860.

FREE SUFFRAGE—NEW YORK STATE ELECTION.

We hope no friend of equal rights in the State of New York, who has, himself, the right of voting, will fail to cast his ballot, at the coming election, in favor of providing for the exercise of the same right, by all our fellow citizens, irrespective of color. There is no longer any shadow of excuse for neglecting this simple act of justice to our colored brethren. The pretense that the colored population of this State and of this city, are vicious and troublesome members of society, has received such an official refutation, that no persons of common intelligence and decency, it may be presumed, will ever repeat the slander again. About one-third part of the colored people of this State reside in this city. And by official returns, two or three years since, it was ascertained that the number of complaints and arrests of colored persons for assaults, thefts, and other disorderly conduct was decidedly less numerous, in the comparison with their relative population, than of the white people. It is admitted, on all hands, that the condition of the colored population in the rural districts and small cities and villages, is better than in this city, and they are admitted to constitute an orderly and useful class of citizens. What excuse, then, can there be, for not allowing them the equal exercise of the right of suffrage? They bear their proportion of the burdens of society. Why should they not enjoy their proportion of its benefits?

For the Principia.

The Church Anti-Slavery Society before the New-York General Association at Syracuse

Previous to the meeting of the N. Y. General Association, the Secretary of the Church Anti-Slavery Society addressed the people on Monday evening, by permission of the Pastor, REV. M. E. STRIEBY, in the Congregational Church, and the meeting adopted this expression of opinion:

Resolved, That, in the judgment of this meeting, the change of opinion and expression which has taken place in the South upon the subject of Slavery, constituting a virtual apostasy from the faith of the Fathers, and from the principles and precepts of the Bible, makes it incumbent upon Northern Christians to reprove in love those Southern professors of christianity who uphold and practice slavery; and to refuse them the ordinary signs of christian fellowship, as a scriptural and necessary rebuke for their countenance and practice of a sin hateful to God and abhorrent from christianity.

Resolved, That as the sin of slavery consists in the animus and act of slaveholding, it is for ministers and churches to say distinctly to the slaveholder, Thou art the man, and to treat him as one whose practice is *prima facie* evidence of his destination of christianity.

Resolved, That in our view, the time has fully come for Northern churches and ministers to take position and de-

place themselves upon the question of christian abolitionism; that is, the duty of abolishing slavery in the name of Christ; and that we should henceforth willingly welcome the charge and bear the cross of being called abolitionists.

On Wednesday A. M. a hearing was granted before the General Association to the Church Anti-Slavery Society; and it was proposed to consider as a topic of discussion in the Evening, the relations of the Church to Slavery,—by reason of which no formal proposition was at once submitted to the Convention. In the Evening, after the Sacramental Sermon in the afternoon, by Rev. J. A. Thome of Cleveland, there was reason to fear that the proposed topic might be crowded out, when Mr. Bulkley unexpectedly rose and offered a Resolution, in support of which he delivered an able speech.

Rev. Mr. Thome, delegate from the Ohio Congregationalists, succeeded him, in a very impressive speech of which it is to be regretted that there were no notes taken. The Secretary of the Church Anti-Slavery Society was also called upon for particular information as to the origin and history of the Society; and there was a familiar colloquy upon the subject, at the close of which, by reason of the lateness of the hour and the absence of several brethren, it was deemed best to postpone the adoption of the Resolution of Mr. Bulkley another year. It therefore holds over, in the following terms:

Resolved, That the Church Anti-Slavery Society meets a strong want and fills a felt void among Evangelical christians, who are opposed to our national system of oppression, and that we hereby cordially commend its principles and operations to the Congregational Churches of this State.

ITEMS.

The Federal officials have again arrested and imprisoned S. M. Boorn. What will the State of Wisconsin do? Will its constituted authorities now do their duty and protect him? Or will they again leave their work to be done irregularly, by the populace?

There have been reports of a rising of negroes in Princess Anne and Norfolk Counties, Virginia. A considerable number of negroes have been arrested, and the Norfolk Herald says that there is sufficient testimony against them.

Steam Ship Connaught, Wilson, Master, running between Galway and New York and Boston, has been burned, at sea. Passengers, crew, and all mails saved.

The Elections in Ohio and Indiana, appear to have been favorable to the Republicans. In Pennsylvania the Republicans have elected their Governor, Curtin, by a majority, it is believed, of from ten to twenty-five thousand. The Times takes the larger figure. The Tribune says, ten or fifteen.

The Coalition against Lincoln, in the State of New York, seems, at last, to be consummated, and, as some understand it, by the virtual withdrawal of the Breckinridge ticket. This, if endorsed and acted upon by the Democratic masses, will give the Republicans a hard job, but their Pennsylvania victory inspires them with fresh courage and hopefulness and that is half the battle.

News of the Day.

STATE OF ILLINOIS RADICAL ABOLITION CONVENTION.

This Convention, convened in Lexington, McLean Co., Illinois, on the 19th of Sept., 1860. Dr. P. Crouch was chosen Chairman, and John W. Mahan Sec'y. Delegates were present from the following counties, viz.: McLean, Livingston, Stark, Peoria and LaSalle.

Letters were read from 32 persons in the Counties of Madison, Kendall, Iroquois, Will, Cook, Du Page, Lee, Carroll, LaSalle, Warren, Kane, Rock-Island.

The following Platform was adopted, and also the following nominations made:

RADICAL ABOLITION PLATFORM.

Adopted at their State Convention, held in Lexington, McLean Co., Illinois, September 19th, 1860.

WHEREAS, the Republican party has failed to justify the hopes excited at its origin, of being an efficient and honest Anti-slavery agency, and has at its recent Chicago Convention, both by the positive and negative features of its platform and especially by a most significant nomination for the Presidency of the United States, abandoned all the great objects of a quarter of a century of anti-slavery labor

and self-sacrifice, and positively committed itself to the maintenance of the most formidable positions of American slavery; and whereas, the so-called Democratic party of the country has been rendered by its antagonistic and repellent principles of aristocracy and democracy, leaving the northern or democratic wing of said party in a chaotic state, therefore

Resolved, That it is eminently expedient at the present time, to erect and maintain with uncompromising fidelity to principles, the standard of "True Democracy," the central idea of which is Liberty, the foundation of which is Justice, and the legitimate end of which is individual elevation, domestic happiness, public prosperity and universal well-being.

2. That in pursuance of the consideration above, we do now assume the name of the True Democracy, and hereby present the following as our platform of principles.

1. Resolved, That Natural Justice being the Supreme Law of the universe, is, and of a right ought to be, the supreme law of the land.

2. The people, *en masse*, are endowed by their Creator with absolute political supremacy, limited only by natural justice which can never change nor yield,—in the language of Jefferson, "The people *en masse* are independent of all but moral law."

3. According to the political axiom on which our government was founded, that all men are endowed by their Creator with the inalienable rights of life and liberty, we maintain that no power can have any more right to deprive a man of liberty than of his life: no more right to hold a man than to commit murder, and hence we repudiate all laws which involve the maintenance of slavery, as piratical in their character and imposing no more moral obligation upon the citizens than laws authorizing willful murder.

4. Holding that the great end of government is to protect men in the peaceful enjoyment of their natural rights, and especially to protect the weak against the powerful; that matters of mere commerce will ordinarily regulate themselves under the general laws of commerce, better than they can be regulated by legislation, therefore, it should be the chief end and aim of the True Democracy simply to protect the persons and natural rights of every individual, in the most free and untrammelled pursuit of whatever interest the spirit of enterprise may prompt him to, assuring him of legal protection, in person and property, in any business, the prosecution of which is compatible with the public weal and the inalienable rights of men.

5. The institution of American slavery being absolutely fatal to all known and expressed objects of the constitution of the United States, and the grossest violation of the principles of all natural justice, and the most stupendous compound of all possible crime known to human experience, involving all of the malignant elements, without one redeeming feature of ordinary aristocracy; we hereby declare it grossly inconsistent with true democratic principles, either directly to hasten it or to be in any manner or degree accessory to its continuance; and we declare it to be the appropriate mission of the True Democracy to establish and maintain a system of political justice that shall drive the last relic of slavery and all forms of aristocracy and despotism from the consecrated soil of America, and especially we will urge the immediate repeal of the Fugitive Slave law, the abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia, the prohibition of the inter state-slave trade, and any other constitutional measures that may tend to the destruction of slavery.

6. Holding firmly that the religious element of human nature requires the most unembarrassed freedom for its appropriate development, and that no man is blame-worthy for the color of his skin, or the place of his birth, we denounce as anti-Democratic the least proscription of a man on account of the creed of his church, the color of his skin or the place of his birth: we hail man everywhere as man and extend to him the right hand of political fellowship, and make common cause with the oppressed of our race.

7. While assuming that national courtesy and friendship towards worthy sister governments is one of the most indispensable, graceful and profitable of political virtues, and that it ill becomes a powerful republic to covet the territory of another sovereign, or to foment discontent amongst its peaceful inhabitants; and while we denounce all aggressive means of conquest, whose end is mere physical or political aggrandizement, yet we hereby declare and we will ever assume and maintain the Universal Principle of Popular Sovereignty, by virtue of which any people or community possesses the natural right to choose its own government, to make its own laws, to change its dynasty or transfer its allegiance from one power to another at its own discretion; that government is a duty, not an interest; that the claim of any person to exercise authority over an unwilling people, is an usurpation fatal to the rights of man. And hence, if any neighboring province or Island should seek a confederated alliance and participation with our government, we should hail the application with hearty welcome, only on the eternal principle of natural justice, and always in consistency with the rights of man.

8. That we endorse the platform of principles adopted by the National Radical Abolition convention at Syracuse, N. Y., and recommend the nominees of said convention to the suffrages of the friends of Liberty throughout the nation.

9. That we recognize in the paper edited by Wm. Goodell of N. Y., an able and faithful exponent of the true principles of free government or true Democracy, and recommend it as

eminently worthy of the patronage of all intelligent and earnest friends of Liberty, and further that we recommend the circulation of Spooner's great work on the Unconstitutionality of Slavery.

With these principles, unalterable as Justice, enduring as time, unchangeable as truth and valuable as human weal, we unfurl our banner to the breeze, and inscribe upon it, No Change but progress, and DEFEAT BY DEATH.

NOMINATIONS.

For Governor, John Hossack, LaSalle Co. Lieutenant Governor, John W. Bushnell, Cook Co. For Auditor, Dr. I. Stout, LaSalle Co. Secretary of state, Phineas Crouch, Peoria Co. Treasurer, Thomas Filer, Du Page Co. Sup't Public Instruction, James Bamford, Peoria Co. Presidential Electors at large, Milton Smith, Du Page Co. and John W. Mahan, of Mc. Lean Co.

DISTRICT ELECTORS.

James Andrus, Lee Co. Ebenezer Palmer, Will Co. Delos Dutton, Kane Co. B. G. Wright, Rock Island Co. Samuel Seely, Peoria Co. John Henry, Kendall Co. H. M. Robb, Mercer Co. H. H. Griffin, Warren Co. J. H. Ely, Carroll Co.

STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE.

John Hossack, Ottawa. Dr. I. Stout, do. G. W. Bassett, do. John W. Mahan, Lexington.

JOHN W. MAHAN, Sec'y.

* Added by Committee on vacancies, in conformity with Letters from Mercer Co.

DU PAGE CO. ILLINOIS, CONVENTION.

From the Wheaton Flag.

RADICAL ABOLITION CONVENTION.

The radical abolitionists of Du Page county met in convention at Danby on the 17th Sept., and passed the following resolutions unanimously:

1. Resolved, That the United States Government was ordained, and is well calculated, by the general provisions of its constitution, to establish justice and secure the blessings of Liberty to all the people of the United States as well as the Territories.

2. That the Radical Abolitionists are the only party which proposes to administer the government in accordance with the plain, common sense meaning of the language of the constitution.

3. That the Radical Abolitionists are the only true Conservators of the constitution; while all the other parties are in duty bound, by their own construction of that instrument, and the express language of the declaration of independence, to resort to a revolution for its overthrow.

4. That the Radical Abolitionists are the only true Union party; because it is the only party which proposes to remove the only bone of contention between the rival sections; thereby putting out of the power of the slave oligarchy to keep northern doughfaces in a perpetual ferment, about what they call the nigger question.

5. That the Radical Abolitionists are the only true national party; for they propose to institute a national government, in accordance with the United States constitution.

6. That the Radical Abolitionists are the only party who propose any practicable means of putting an end to the slavery agitation; for if slavery is not abolished the agitation must continue as long as there are any real christians left unhung in the nation.

7. That so long as abolitionists labored earnestly for the overthrow of Slavery in the States and Federal District, the slave power had enough to do to maintain its position at home; and consequently were unable to carry slavery into the Territories.

8. That we solemnly believe that the annexation of Texas and the Mexican war, the Fugitive Slave Act and Nebraska Bill, the Dred Scott Decision and the murder of John Brown are the just judgments of God upon our nation for the political sins of the abolitionists.

9. That the above encroachments of the slave power are the "half loaves" that have always been gained by voting for the "least of two evils" on the principle that "half a loaf is better than no bread."

10. That, according to the Declaration of Independence, it is the bounden duty of the people of the United States to alter or abolish any government, either State or National, that does not provide for the security of the natural rights of all the people.

11. That the principle of "Squatter Sovereignty," the great Diana of the Democrats, the image that fell down from Douglas, whom all the world worshipeth, when stripped of the political slang thrown over it by unprincipled demagogues and cowardly doughfaces, amounts simply to this, the free white men of "our glorious Yankee nation" have an inalienable right to go into the public domain of our own country, or any other that we can conquer; and to establish therein any system of government which they in their wisdom or their folly may think proper, either for the purpose of governing themselves as rational men, or for the purpose of governing others as irrational cattle, without any fear of God or regard for man; and that the State Sovereignty of the Republicans is a "chip of the same block."

12. That we have no confidence in any party making ever

so loud professions of attachment to the principles of the Declaration of Independence, and regard for the rights of "free white laborers" in the distant territories, while they gratuitously pledge themselves to leave the "poor white trash" in the States under the heel of the merciless man-stealer; and totally ignore the barbarous, anti-Republican Black codes of their own Black Republican States.

13. That we deeply deplore the fate, and in some measure disapprove the rash valor of that noble champion of liberty Capt. John Brown; yet, we cannot but admire and honor his constant firmness of character and great love of his race which led him to encounter almost certain death for the benefit of a distant and despised people who he knew could never reward him in the least; while we regard with loathing the cowardly miscreants who dared not spare the life of an aged christian whom the world generally considered a well meaning but misguided maniac.

14. Believing the sale and use of intoxicating drinks to be highly injurious to the cause of human rights; therefore Resolved, that we earnestly exhort the nominees of our party to make no use of such liquors for electioneering purposes; and advise our young men to conduct their political clubs and "Wide-Awake" companies on principles of strict temperance, sobriety and christian morality, "regardless of consequences."

15. That nothing really beneficial is ever gained by sacrificing principle for the sake of success.

Editors who believe in the Declaration of Independence, and are friendly to the cause of human rights, and love to do as they would be done by, are respectfully requested to give the above resolutions an insertion in their excellent papers, and oblige their most humble servant,

THOMAS FILER, Sec'y.

For the Principia.

RADICAL ABOLITION MEETING AT MARTINSBURG, OHIO.

According to previous notice, a number of the citizens of this vicinity met in the Free Presbyterian Church, at two o'clock, P. M., Aug. 25. The meeting was organized by electing Eld. S. COOK Chairman, and J. B. DAWSON Secretary. Rev. JOSEPH WHITHAM stated as the object of the meeting, a consideration of the proper course to be pursued by christians, in the coming Presidential election.

The following resolutions were received, and on a motion to adopt, the Rev. Mr. WHITHAM made some very appropriate and pertinent remarks. Also some others (S. B. DODD, M. D., WM. ALLEN, and J. B. CAMPBELL) after which they were adopted.

Whereas, slavery, as it exists in these United States, is a great moral, social, and political wrong, a grievous injury, not only to the poor helpless slave, but also to the merciless slave owner, and likewise to the more guilty slaveholder. In its tendency having a most corrupting influence upon the minds of all who are in any way associated with it, as to interest or support, leading, in many instances, to all kinds of debauchery and crime, and above all, being a heinous sin against high Heaven,

And whereas, this God-dishonoring and man-destroying system owes its existence and continuance to the will of the American people, (in whose hands is the power) as carried out in acts, thus rendering them responsible, and, as a matter of course, highly culpable,

Therefore, Resolved, that as christians and citizens, we will clear our skirts by using our most earnest and unwearied endeavors to speedily remove this foul blot from our country; trusting to the Almighty for guidance and strength.

Resolved, that, knowingly, we will elevate, by our vote, no man to any high post of honor or trust, within our gift, who is not heartily in favor of the great object for which governments were established among men; and who is not willing to labor for the carrying out of the object, by using all the influence and power in his possession for the immediate and unconditional abolition of slavery, wherever it is found within our country.

Resolved, that inasmuch as civil government is an ordinance of God, designed for honest and God-honoring purposes, it is our duty to vote for no man, for any civil office, who does not give evidence that he is a God-fearing man, a man of truth, a man who hates covetousness, and is a just man.

Resolved, that we will support the nominees of the Radical Abolition Convention to be held in Syracuse, N. Y., the 29th instant, in case said nominees represent the views embodied in the foregoing preamble and resolutions.

Resolved, that the proceedings of this meeting be published in the Principia, and Free Church Portfolio, and the Preamble and Resolutions be forwarded to the Convention in Syracuse.

On motion adjourned. STEPHEN COOK, Chairman.
J. B. DAWSON, Sec.

MARTINSBURG, O., Aug. 25, 1860.

For the Principia.

RADICAL ABOLITION CONVENTION IN MICHIGAN.

Editor of the Principia: I send you, in brief, the doings of our convention, held in Detroit, Oct. 4th, pursuant to call. After the appointment of officers and the offering of

prayer, the convention proceeded to the discussion and unanimous adoption of the following Resolutions:

Whereas, the Radical Abolition Party was formed for the suppression of the internal slave trade, the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, the repeal of the Fugitive Slave Bill, the non-admission of more slave States, the abolition of slavery in all the slave States, and to execute all political righteousness. And, whereas, the National nominees of all the other political parties are opposed to all this action of the Radical Abolition Party, not excepting the Republican Party.

Therefore, Resolved, that Radical Abolitionists cannot vote for these candidates without a gross violation of their principles.

Resolved, that we nominate William Goodell, of New York, for President of the United States, and Samuel McFarland, of Pennsylvania, for Vice-President.

The following persons were then chosen as candidates for Presidential electors.

ELECTORS AT LARGE.

Robert Garner, John Lowry.

DISTRICT ELECTORS.

Asa Walters, William Chamberlin, George Thompson, William Peters.

C. C. Foot, of Detroit was appointed to procure the printing and distribution of tickets.

ROBT. GARNER, President,
ELISHA GALPIN, Sec.

THE CONVENTION AT WORCESTER.

The Anti-Slavery Standard, of Oct. 6, contains an account of the proceedings of the Political Anti-Slavery Convention at Worcester, of which notice was given in the Principia. Dr. DANIEL MANN, of Ohio, Presided. WM. A. WILSON was Secretary.

S. S. FOSTER introduced Resolutions affirming that "the Constitution, rightly interpreted, is entirely and unequivocally on the side of freedom," &c., &c., and proposing to "organize a Political Association, to be known as the Union Democratic party of the United States," on that basis.

The Resolutions were debated at some length, being supported by Messrs. FOSTER, and Douglas, and opposed by T. W. HIGGINSON, of Worcester, E. D. DRAPER, of Hopedale, JOSEPH A. HOWLAND, and LUCY STONE. We do not see that any disposition was made of the Resolutions, by any vote of the Convention, but they appear to have been superseded by the following.

In the evening, Mr. Foster introduced Resolutions, of which the following are the principal ones.

Resolved, that the great want of our country at the present time is a National Political Education Society, whose object shall be to educate the people, the rulers of the country, in a thorough knowledge of the fundamental principles of democratic government, and of their duty to defend and enforce those principles, in every part of the Union, for the impartial protection of all inhabitants, irrespective of color, condition, sex, or nationality.

Resolved, that a Committee of five be appointed by this Convention to correspond with prominent friends of freedom in different sections of the country upon this subject, with power to call a Convention for the purpose of organizing such an association at such time and place as they may deem expedient.

On the next day the discussion was continued, embracing some debate, concerning the American Anti-Slavery Society, whose position was defended by Lucy Stone, Joseph A. Howland, and E. D. Draper.

The following is the closing part of the minutes.

In the evening, on motion of Mr. Foster, the Resolutions in relation to an Anti-Slavery Educational Society were adopted. Mr. Foster moved the adoption of the platform, and the formation of an Executive Committee to make nominations, and to call another Convention, if they shall see fit. Mr. Douglass spoke in favor of the motion. Mr. Howland criticized his remarks. Mr. Foster advocated his motion, and it was adopted unanimously. The Chairman of the Nominating Committee reported:

For the Anti-Slavery Educational Committee: S. S. Foster, J. H. Stephenson, A. P. Brown, Frederick Douglas, and J. H. Fowler.

For the Executive Committee: S. S. Foster and A. P. Brown of Worcester, J. H. Stephenson of Boston, Frederick Douglas of Rochester, N. Y., J. H. Fowler of Cambridge, Ernestine L. Rose of New York, Elizabeth C. Stanton, and John Pierpont.

The nominees were unanimously elected.

On motion of Mr. Douglas the following resolution was adopted:

Resolved, That the members of this Convention, called to consider the proposition to form a sound Abolition political party, extended their earnest sympathy and their hearty God-speed to the little band of faithful Abolitionists which has nominated GARRET SARGIS as their candidate to be supported for the Presidency in the coming election.

After further remarks by Mr. Douglass and Mr. Foster

the Convention adjourned, subject to the call of the Executive Committee.

Letters were received from Henry T. Cheever, of Jewett City, Conn.; Homer B. Sprague, of New Haven, Conn.; Elnathan Davis of Fitchburg, and many others, endorsing the movement, and from Charles Sumner and others against the movement.

DANIEL MANN, President.
WM. A. WILSON, Secretary.

AMERICAN BOARD AND THE SLAVE TRADE.

The Am. Board of Foreign Missions has been holding its Semi-Centennial Jubilee at Boston.

A correspondent of THE WORLD gives some account of the proceedings, from which we take the following.

GABOON MISSION.

"Dr. Hawes, of the committee on the African mission at Gaboon, made a report favorable to the mission. On the question of its acceptance, Richard E. Selden, esq., of Lyme, Ct., said he had read the report of the prudential committee on the Gaboon mission, which was in substance that 'the French 'emigrant trade' seems likely to be coming to an end in the region of the Gaboon, and in some other respects the mission has better prospects.' He would like to be informed what those 'better prospects' are. For his part, he did not think the mission could be worse than at present."

[Mr. Selden proceeded to decry the mission, and its results, and said]

"Why should this money, and these noble men and women, be sent to the miasmatic swamps and the black skins of Africa, when there are so many millions in Asia who have not forgotten the name of God, and who are ready to receive the gospel? Can you cause the leopard to change his spots? You have tried it for eighteen years in the Gaboon, and what are the results? While you have succeeded in making a few white, they don't stay so. Will heaven leaven snow or anthracite so as to make better bread than of wheat? He would have the prudential committee consider seriously and act slowly. I believe you sometimes use the figure of a field ready for the harvest. Now, should I send my reapers into some corner of the field where nothing but tares, and cockles, and bitter weed may be found, and expect them to return with sheaves laden with wheat?"

At this point, a person calling himself Thomas Parker Knox, arose in the back part of the audience, and, in a very excited manner, said he would hurl back with contempt any imputations or reflections on the African race. He believed they had their origin in the infernal system of slavery. This speaker was speedily ruled out of order, and his boisterous voice ceased.

THE SLAVE TRADE.

Rev. H. T. Cheever now rose and offered an amendment to the report on the African missions, embracing an inquiry relative to papers offered at the meeting of the Board last year, with a memorial to Congress respecting the slave trade.

Some points of order were here raised by Chancellor Walworth and Dr. Beman, whereupon Hon. Linus Child suggested that a reading of so much of the secretary's report as relates to this subject would set this matter in the right light.

Accordingly Dr. Anderson read from the report the opinion of Rev. Wm. Walker, one of the missionaries at Gaboon, that the slave trade does not interfere with the labors of the missionaries at Gaboon or Zulu, and that it is not expedient, at this time, to memorialize Congress upon the subject. The French have been carrying on an "emigrant trade," which amounts to a slave trade in another form, but it is believed that this trade will very soon be discontinued. Should this trade continue it may be desirable to bring the matter before our government.

Rev. H. T. Cheever expressed satisfaction at the explanation, but should have preferred to have had it presented before. He now offered a resolution asking for the appointment of a committee to report what further action, if any, was necessary relative to the slave trade on the coast of Africa, as a feeder to the system of American slavery. He further remarked that Dr. Anderson said, last year, that the slave trade was an injury to the mission; and Messrs. Walker and Bushnell has stated the whole missionary force on the coast of Africa does not equal the number of vessels engaged in the slave trade there from the single port of New York annually.

Mr. Cheever was finally ruled out of order, and the question on the report of Dr. Hawes was accepted.

CHURCH OF THE PURITANS.—On Friday evening, at the conclusion of the services connected with the regular weekly lecture, a meeting of the Church was called for the purpose of receiving an address signed by fifty evangelical ministers of various States. The address tenders sympathy and encouragement in regard to the attitude which the Church holds toward Slavery. It was drawn up by the Rev. J. R. W. Sloane pastor of the Third Reformed Presbyterian Church in this city. The Rev. Mr. Davis moved a preamble embodying the above facts, and the following resolution:

Resolved, That their "testimony of confidence and respect" is especially gratifying to us, now that "the work is great," our pastor absent, and there may be adversaries; that in its sentiments

we recognize the spirit and in His words of lofty cheer; and you men, be strong," we hear the voice of the Master, "be faithful unto death;" that we tender our sincere thanks to these dear brethren, and ask a continued remembrance in their prayers; and the prayers of the faithful in the church they represent; that we rejoice greatly for the consolation of the good confidence they have as to our absent pastor; that we cheerfully accept the charge they give us to stand by and cordially sustain him, and we here pledge ourselves to seek in his support the harmony, purity, and edification of the Church, and endeavor to keep the unity of the spirit in the bonds of peace.

Dr. West seconded the preamble and resolution.

Dr. White wished to know who were meant by "adversaries," as Dr. Cheever had said in his letter to Mr. Spurgeon that he was beset "by enemies without and foes within the church."

Mr. Davis said that the word "adversaries" was meant to apply to all who might have been expected to be co-workers in the great cause of human emancipation but who occupied an unfriendly attitude towards those who had determined to sustain an unshackled pulpit in the treatment of all evils which were at variance with the spirit and letter of the gospel.

The motion was unanimously adopted.—*Tribune.*

EUROPE.

By the *City of Baltimore*, Liverpool dates are received to 26th Sept.

The French journals publish the Pope's reply to Gen. de Noue, on the occasion of the officers of the Sixty-second French infantry being presented to his Holiness. He said:

"The Church does not stand in need of man's help in support of her spiritual Sovereignty, but it has pleased God that, for the free exercise of her spiritual Sovereignty she should also possess temporal power, it is this last power that you are called on to defend, in its integrity."

In Gen. Guyon's order of the day, on resuming the command of the French garrison at Rome, he says:

"Called on afresh, and under circumstances still more serious than before, to protect the interests of Catholicism in the person of the Holy Father, who is its most legitimate and highest representative, and to guarantee the security of the Holy City, which is the seat of it, we shall all be equal to this great mission, and ready if necessary, to make every sacrifice for its accomplishment. Our forces have been increased, in order to meet the requirements of our situation."

The Paris correspondent of the London *News* corroborates a statement in the London *Herald's* Paris letter, and states that the Marquis de Cadore, the First Secretary of the French Legation at Rome, arrived in Paris on Monday with important dispatches, the substance of which is understood to be that unless within a very short time the Emperor takes measures to drive the Piedmontese out of the Marches of Umbria, and to restore the Pope to the possession of his dominions in their integrity, the Pope will leave Rome, and place his person under the protection of some other Power.

Another dispatch says:

"After a short combat the troops of the 4th Corps d'Armée occupied the suburbs of the Porta Pia of Ancona. The enemy with four pieces of cannon, is defending the gates of the town of Ancona."

A dispatch from Turin dated the 26th says:

"The King is about to leave for Bologna. The Government conveys to Trieste 1,000 Austrian prisoners of war lately mercenaries in the service of the Pope. A report is circulated that Signor Cattaneo has been appointed Pro-Dictator of Naples. M. Ledru Rollin is at Naples."

By the *Africa*—left Liverpool, the 29th ult.

FALL OF ANCONA.

BY TELEGRAPH TO QUEENSTOWN.

TURIN, Saturday, Sept. 29.

Ancona capitulated this morning. Lamoriciere is a prisoner with the whole garrison.

THE WAR IN ITALY.

The Sardinians are reported to have carried on their siege operations at Ancona, and notwithstanding the desperate resistance of the garrison, they took Fort Dell'egrage.

Victor Emanuel would leave for Florence and Bologna on the 29th.

It was asserted that the Pope's ultimatum for Franco threatens that he will quit Rome at once unless France interferes to stop the progress of the Sardinians. A majority of the Cardinals are reported to have recommended his departure.

Additional French troops have been ordered, and the French outposts had been placed two miles beyond Rome.

The repulse of the Garibaldians at Capua is fully confirmed. One account says that they lost four hundred killed and wounded, and three hundred prisoners. Their positions were nevertheless maintained, and the attack renewed in force.

The King's troops are reported to number fifty thousand, and he is determined to show fight.

The Garibaldian Ministry had resigned, on account of the preponderance of Beetsine. Signor Conforti was about to form a new Ministry professing extreme opinions.

It was reported that Lamoriciere, after his late defeat, returned to Ancona with a considerable number of troops.

The text of Lord John Russell's warning to Sardinia, not to attack Venice, is published.

THE PRINCE OF WALES IN NEW YORK.

As our paper is almost ready for the press, the whole city is agog, to see the *Prince of Wales*, who is hourly expected. It will be well, if we can keep hands enough in the office, to get the paper out, in due season.

MEXICO.

A telegram from Washington states that information has been received from Mexico to the effect that the Government of Great Britain contemplates an entire withdrawal of diplomatic relations with Miramon; and it is asserted that the Spanish Minister at the Mexican capital has received the most urgent advice from the authorities at Havana to treat the Liberal Government with the greatest respect. It has already been announced that another proposition on the part of the British Government to mediate for the restoration of peace has been rejected by the Liberals. All these facts seem to indicate that the position of the Juarez Government is becoming stronger, and that the struggle now in progress for the supremacy will soon be decided in its favor.

WALKER'S PROTEST.—When Walker was surrendered to Capt. Salmon, he made the following protest:

I hereby protest, before the civilized world, that when I surrendered to the captain of her Majesty's steamer *Icarus*, that officer expressly received my sword and pistol, as well as the arms of Col. Rudler; and the surrender was expressly and in so many words to him, as the representative of her Britannic Majesty,

WILLIAM WALKER.

On board the steamer *Icarus*, Sept 2, 1860.

It appears from the correspondence that passed between Commander Salmon of the *Icarus*, and Gen. Walker, at Truxillo, that the former, far from showing any unnecessary cruelty, did all in his power to save the wretched man and his deluded followers. In a letter dated the 21st ult., Walker then being in possession of Truxillo, Capt. Salmon informed him that the Custom-house receipts of the port of Truxillo were mortgaged to his Government for the payment of a debt, and that, to protect the interests of Great Britain, he must reestablish the legitimate authority of Honduras. In the same communication he offered Walker the protection of the British flag if he would lay down his arms, refund the money that he or his followers had taken from the Custom-house, and leave the country. These terms were formally accepted by Walker in a letter addressed to Capt. Salmon; but while they were in course of arrangement, the filibusters surreptitiously evacuated Truxillo and thereby forfeited all claim, if they ever had any, to mercy or consideration. The *Icarus*, with a force of Hondureños followed in pursuit, and on the 3d instant they were captured and brought back to the city. Walker, of course, and with his usual effrontery, protests "before the civilized world" against being delivered over to the tender mercies of the Hondureños. He claims that he surrendered to the British officer, but as he himself violated the conditions which were proposed to him, and which he engaged to fulfill, there was clearly no surrender at all.—*N. Y. Times.*

SUBSTITUTE FOR LEATHER.

An artificial substitute for real leather is now manufactured in considerable quantity, and known by the name of vegetable leather. Its face and general character resemble the natural product so closely, that it is only by actual examination that the difference can be determined. This is more particularly the case in that description which is made for book-binding and like purposes.

Amongst other advantages which this article possesses over leather proper is, that, however thin the imitation is, it will not tear without considerable force is exercised. It resists all damp, and moisture may be left upon it for any period without injury; consequently, it does not sicken or cockle, is always dry, and its polish is rather increased than diminished by friction. To scratch or raise its surface with the nails, or by contact with any ordinary substance, will not abrade it. The largest entire piece of real leather that can be cut from a bullock's hide is not more than seven feet by five, and this includes the stomach and other inferior parts. Vegetable leather, on the contrary, is produced fifty yards in length and one and a half yards wide, every portion being of equal and any required thickness, and the smallest portion is convertible. Cautchouc and naphtha are used in its manufacture, but by a peculiar chemical process all odor is removed from the naphtha, and the smell of vegetable leather is thus rendered less strong, if anything, than that of real leather, which is an especial merit. The principal object to which this article is now applied are carriage and horse aprons, soldier's belts, buckets which pack flat, harness of every description, bookbinding, etc. For bookbinding, its toughness, washable quality, and resistance to stains, render it remarkably fitted. Its thickness, which may be carried to any extent, is obtained by additional backings of linen, etc., cemented with cautchouc.

Family Miscellany.

For The Principia.

TO THE BABY.

Smile on, darling, with the smile
That you caught from Heaven,
When the angels lent awhile
What we thought was given!

Smile, though in that smile we see
Pitying angels warning,
Not to think our heaven is thee,
Thou art but the dawning;

And thick clouds may come between,
Dark with black'ning sorrow,
E'er the first clear ray is seen
Of the promised morrow.

Shall we lose thee, little one?
Smiling all too brightly,
Glad'ning all, and wearying none,
In our arms too lightly

Resting, like the softest down
With the snow drop's fairness;
Thou of beauty seem'st at the crown;
Thine the diamond's rareness!

Blossom from the eternal throne,
By the living river;
E'er its fairy petals blown,
Backward must we give her!

Lo, she smiling answer gives
(Token still of heaven),
Would you have the light that lives
In her blue eyes, given

By the storm-clouds of this earth,
That are sure to gather
O'er each head of mortal birth?
Would you not much rather

That like morning star it set
In its native ether,
While no danger she hath met;
Nothing yet to grieve her!

Oh! we leave thee, sweetest one,
With our Heavenly Father,
Best that His dear will be done
For us and thee together;

Whether thy fair life go on,
Each day brighter shining,
Or thy little sun go down,
Loveliest in declining;

We will ask not, so He bless thee
With His richest blessing,
So that Christ's dear love embrace thee
Close as our caressing.

He will never lose thee, love,
There we leave thee, dearest,
Thy lot we dare not choose thee, love,
Thought to our hearts the nearest.

Then smile on, darling, with such smiles
As angels out of Heaven,
Soft whispering in thy dreams oft whiles,
Have to thy sweet lips given!

M. J.

"BE HAPPY AS YOU ARE."—"Wife and mother, are you tired and out of patience with your husband's and your children's demands upon your time and attention? Are you tempted to speak out angry feelings to that faithful, but, perhaps, sometimes heedless or exacting husband of yours? or to scold and fret at those sweet and beautiful ones? Do you groan and say, 'what a fool I was to marry, and leave my father's house, where I lived at ease and in quiet? Are you, by reason of the care and weariness of body which wifehood and motherhood must bring, forgetful of, and unmindful for, their comforts and their joys? Oh wife and mother, what if a stroke should smite your husband, and lay him low? What if your children should be snatched from your arms, and from your bosom? What if there were no true, strong heart for you to lean upon? What if there were no soft little innocents to nestle in your arms, and to love you, or receive your love? How would it be with you then? Be patient and kind, dear wife; be unwearying and long suffering, dear mother; for you know not how long you may have with you your best and dearest treasures—you know not how long you may tarry with them. Let there be nothing for you to remember which will wring your heart with remorse if they leave you alone, let there be nothing for them to remember but sweetness and love unutterable, if you are called to leave them by the way. Be patient, be pitiful, be tender of them all, for death will step sooner or later between them and you. And oh! what would you do, if you should be doomed to sit solitary and alone through years and years? Be happy as you are, even with all your trials; for believe it, thou wife of a loving and true husband, there is no lot so blessed as thine own."—*Ex.*

TALKING AND WRITING.

Many hard students lose their relish for society, and regard it as a great loss of time to mingle in company instead of poring over their books. But the most eminent and successful writers, like Shakspeare and Bacon, have been distinguished for conversational as well as literary power, and the following extract from *Blackwood's Magazine* presents an important truth.

A man never knows what he has read until he has talked about it, or written about it. Talking and writing are digestive processes which are absolutely essential to the mental constitution of the man who devours many books. But it is not every man that can talk. Talking implies, first of all, a readiness on the part of the speaker, and next a sympathetic listener. It is therefore, as a digestive process, the most difficult, if not the most rapid in its operation. Writing is a different affair; a man may take his time to it, and not require a reader; he can be his own reader. It is an easier, although more formal, process of digestion than talking. It is in every body's power and every body who reads much, makes more or less use of it, because as Bacon says, if he does not write, then he ought to have extraordinary faculties to compensate for such neglect. It is in this view that we are to understand the complaint of a well-known author that he was ignorant of a certain subject; and the means by which he was to dispel his ignorance—namely, by writing on it. It is in this view that the monitorial system of instruction has its great value—to the monitors it is the best sort of teaching.

It is from the same point of view that Sir William Hamilton used to lament the decay of teaching, as a part of the education of students at the universities. In olden time it was necessary to the obtaining of a degree, that the graduate should give evidence of his capacity as a teacher; and in the very titles of his degree, as minister and doctor, he was designated a teacher. A man never knows any thing, Sir William used to say, until he has taught it in some way or other—it may be orally. It may be by writing a book. It is a grand truth, and points a fine moral. Knowledge is knowledge, says the philosopher; it is precious for its own sake, it is an end to itself. But nature says the opposite. Knowledge is not knowledge until we have brought it under the command of the great social faculty, speech; we exist for society, and knowledge is null, until we give it expression, and in so doing make it over to the social instinct.

A SLIGHT MISTAKE.—A country-woman once commented on the labors of Prof. Sedgwick, as with hammer in hand he went through English fields in search of fossils, by tapping significantly on her forehead, as she nodded to a neighbor, and saying, with a sigh, "Something wrong here."

The following anecdote of Newton is quite as good:

"When Sir Isaac Newton changed his residence, and went to live in Leicester place, his next-door neighbor was a widow lady, who was much puzzled by the little she observed of the habits of the philosopher. One of the Fellows of the Royal Society called upon her one day, when, among other domestic news, she mentioned that some one had come to reside in the adjoining house, who, she felt certain, was a poor mad gentleman, 'because,' she continued, 'he diverts himself in the oddest way imaginable. Every morning when the sun shines so brightly that we are obliged to draw the window blinds, he takes his seat before a tub of soap-suds, and occupies himself for four hours blowing soap-bubbles from a common clay pipe, which he intently watches floating about until they burst. He is doubtless,' she added, 'now at his favorite amusement, for it is a fine day; do come and look at him.' The gentleman smiled, and they went up stairs, when, after looking through the staircase window into the adjoining court-yard, he turned and said, 'My dear madam, the person whom you suppose to be a poor lunatic, is no other than the great Sir Isaac Newton, studying the refraction of light upon thin plates, a phenomenon which is beautifully exhibited upon the surface of a common soap-bubble.'"

Just so, the world's profoundest and wisest teachers in religion, morals, and politics, have been accounted madmen, fanatics, impracticables, lunatics, simpletons, men of one idea, just fit to be laughed at by those who never learned the first principles of religion, morals, or civil Government.—Ed.

GOOD OPINION OF ONE'S SELF.

If white people sometimes think negroes incapable of taking care of themselves, negroes sometimes think themselves smarter than white people. Here is an amusing instance:

The late Chief Justice Marshall, was riding one morning to court in his single carriage; his horse fell and broke a shaft. He was puzzled what to do. Tom, a neighboring negro waggoner, happening to drive up, the Chief Justice asked Tom if he would help him out of the difficulty.

"O yes massa, if you'll lend me your knife."

Tom took the knife and cut a sapling pole and a grape vine from a neighboring thicket, with which he speedily spliced up the broken shaft.

"Now, Tom," said the Judge, "why didn't I think of that?"

"O massa," replied Tom, "you know that some people will hab more sense dan others."

THE OIL.

The excitement in the Oil business is on the increase. The Strawbridge well holds out, from the best information we can gather about twelve to fifteen barrels per day. A great number of holes are being made in the vicinity, and the land along the stream, from Lowellville Ohio to Mahoningtown is leased.—Sub leases are being made at enormous profit. On the Shenango we learn that a great amount of the land has been leased for the purpose of boring, and we believe several companies have commenced operations. On Beaver river good indications have been discovered and companies are being formed, and operations commenced in that direction. The arrivals of strangers at New Castle are very numerous, and it will not be long till we shall have a perfect rush.—There can be no doubt that we are as rich in oil as any other portion of the state, with these advantages, that the oil pumped in this vicinity is superior to any other yet discovered, and we have an easy and speedy way of getting it to market. The well near the west end of the Shenango bridge is proging. They have reached the rock and commenced boring. The Company engaged in this enterprise, is able, and will fully test the matter. If oil is found in this vicinity, in paying quantities, five hundred wells will be in operation within a year. This will make the completion of our little Railroad a certainty. So mote it be.—*Newcastle Courant*.

ORIGIN OF COSTUMES.—In the year 1524, Luther laid aside the monk's costume, and thenceforth dressed according to the fashion of the world. He chose black clothes, and consequently that color has become the fashion of the clergy. His reason for choosing this color was this; The elector of Saxony took an interest in him, and now and then sent him a piece of black cloth, being at that time the court fashion, and because Luther preferred it: so his scholars thought it became them to wear the same color as their master. From that time black has been the color most worn by the clergy.

The clergy are now generally distinguished from others by the white cravat, though many of them are laying it aside. This distinction was unknown fifty years ago, when all gentlemen, especially the young, except mariners, wore white cravats. A black neck-tie or cravat, was the badge of the sea-faring men. When the fashion of wearing white cravats changed, the clergy did not take pains to change with it, but kept on, in the old way, as some few steadfast laymen have also done.

The peculiar dress of the Quakers, or Friends, originated in the same way. The founders of the sect neither invented nor prescribed a distinguishing costume, as a badge of membership, as some suppose. The broad-brimmed hat, the drab colored cloth, and the single breasted and straight collared coat, were then generally worn in England by the sober citizens of the middle class, in the country. Fashions soon changed, and have been changing ever since, while Quakers have simply kept on, in the old way. The court dress, too, in respect to the cut of the coat, has, like the Quaker's, remained the same. Hence, also the straight collar is still worn in the naval and military service of G. Britain and the United States, and by the police of the city of New York. Quaker, court, naval, and military steadfastness, having alike withstood change.

ONE HAPPY HEART.—Have you made one happy heart to-day? Envid privilege! How calmly you can seek your pillow, how sweetly sleep! In all this world there is nothing so sweet as giving comfort to the distressed, as getting a sunray into a gloomy heart. Children of sorrow

meet us where we turn; there is no moment that tears are not shed and sighs uttered. Yet how many of those tears, those sighs, are caused by mere thoughtlessness!

HOW MEN LOVE.

"Men are said to admire that which they look up to, and to love that which they look down upon."—*Exchange*.

Is that so gentlemen? Then I pity you! Love only that which you look down upon? Love only that which is inferior to yourself? Sloop to love? Is such a love elevating and ennobling? Does it make you better? Is it any kind of love at all? Isn't it selfishness, double-refined, gratified vanity distilled through the meshes of sentimentism? Analyze it!

A GOOD HIT.

An invalid once sent for a physician, and after detaining him for some time with a description of his pains, aches, &c., he thus sums up:

"Now, doctor, you have humbugged me long enough, with your good-for-nothing pills and worthless syrups; they don't touch the real difficulty. I wish you would strike the cause of my ailments, if it is in your power to reach it."

"It shall be done," said the doctor, at the same time lifting his cane and demolishing a decanter of gin that stood the sideboard.

A GOOD WOMAN NEVER GROWS OLD.—Years may pass over her head, but if benevolence and virtue dwell in her heart, she is as cheerful as when the spring of life opened to her view. When we look at a good woman we never think of her age; she looks charming as when the rose of youth first bloomed on her cheek. That rose has not faded yet; it will never fade. In her neighborhood she is the friend and benefactor. Who does not respect and love the woman who has passed her days in acts of kindness and mercy? We repeat, such a woman can never grow old. She will always be fresh, buoyant in spirits, and active in humble deeds of mercy and benevolence.

The greatest of all earthly blessings is to be able to lean your heart against another heart, faithful, tender, true and tried, and record, with a thankfulness that years deepen, instead of diminishing, 'I have got a friend'

CANNING PEACHES.—We have a method of preserving peaches in cans, which we think far preferable to the usual mode. We use no sugar, as we think the fruit retains its natural flavor much better without it, and it is more wholesome. Our method we give to Rural readers as follows: Peel and halve the peaches; then put them in a steamer, and place over a kettle of boiling water from five to eight minutes, when they will be sufficiently heated; have your cans hot, put in the fruit, filling them full as possible, and seal immediately. When wanted for the table, prepare with sugar and cream the same as fresh fruit, and they will be found equally delicious. Plums can be done in the same way.—C. M. M., Rochester.

The prettiest trimming for a woman's bonnet is a good-humored face.

WRITINGS OF WILLIAM GOODELL

For sale at the office of the *Principia*: For CASH ONLY.

DEMOCRACY OF CHRISTIANITY, 2 Vols., \$1 50..... Postage 30 cts.
SLAVERY AND ANTI-SLAVERY (History of) 1 Vol., \$1 00 Postage 32 c.
AMERICAN SLAVE CODE, 1 Vol., \$0 75..... Postage 16 c.

OUR NATIONAL CHARTERS.

FOR THE MILLIONS.

- I. The Federal Constitution of 1787-9.
- II. The Articles of Confederation, 1778.
- III. The Declaration of Independence, 1776.
- IV. The Articles of Association, 1774.

With notes showing their bearing on slavery, and the relative powers of the State and National Governments. By WILLIAM GOODELL.

A summary of *Legal Rules of Interpretation and Legal opinions*, collected from the highest authorities, is prefixed to the Constitution. An APPENDIX contains extracts from State Constitutions, and Bills of Rights—Ordinance of 1787, excluding slavery from the Northwest Territory; also, sentiments of the Revolutionary fathers, &c.

Price, Single Copies, 12 cents; if by mail, 15 cents, and at the same rate for any number short of 8 copies.

Eight copies, by mail, \$1.00, or 76 cents, at the Office.

Twelve copies, by mail, \$1.36, or \$1.00 at the Office.

Eighteen copies, by mail, \$2, or \$1.46 at the office.

Twenty-seven copies, by mail, \$3, or \$2.19 at the office.

For sale by WILLIAM GOODELL, or M. B. WILLIAMS, Office of the *Principia*, 339 Pearl Street, New York. TERMS, CASH, always in advance.

N.B. All postages on Books, Pamphlets, and Tracts, must be paid at our Post-Office in advance, so that we cannot answer orders, as above, without having received the postage money, as well as the price of the publication.

✱ We have no books, pamphlets, or tracts for sale, except those advertised, above, and it is not convenient for us to receive orders for any others.

D. D. NICHOLSON, PRINTER, 199 WILLIAM STREET, NEW YORK.